

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
at KNOXVILLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

TIMOTHY SANDERS,

*Defendant.*

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

Case No. 3:13-cr-110

Judge Mattice  
Magistrate Judge Guyton

**ORDER**

On May 19, 2014, United States Magistrate Judge H. Bruce Guyton filed his Report and Recommendation (Doc. 29) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In his Report and Recommendation, Magistrate Judge Guyton recommended that Defendant's Motion to Suppress (Doc. 22) be denied. On June 2, 2014, Defendant filed timely objections to the Report and Recommendation. (Doc. 30).

The Court notes that, a party's objections must be "clear enough to enable the district court to discern those issues that are dispositive and contentious," and generally, "the failure to file specific objections to a magistrate's report constitutes a waiver of those objections." *Smith v. Woods*, 505 F. App'x 560, 564 (6th Cir. 2012). In reviewing Defendant's objections, the Court finds that they are merely reiterations of the original arguments raised in his Motion to Suppress. (*Compare* Doc. 22 at 1-3 *with* Doc. 30 at 1-2). Defendant's actions of simply reiterating the arguments of his previous brief and not raising specific objections are inconsistent with notions of judicial efficiency. *Howard v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991).

Thus, the Court finds that further analysis of these same issues would be cumulative and is unwarranted in light of Magistrate Judge Guyton's well-reasoned and well-supported Report and Recommendation, in which he fully addressed Defendant's arguments. Nonetheless, the Court has conducted a review of the record, specifically including those portions to which Defendant has objected, and the Court agrees with Magistrate Judge Guyton's analysis and conclusions. *See* Doc. 29.

Accordingly, the Court **ACCEPTS and ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Guyton's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations pursuant to § 636(b)(1); Defendant's Objections (Doc. 30) are **OVERRULED**; and Defendant's Motion to Suppress Statements (Doc. 22) is **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED** this 27th day of June, 2014.

/s/ Harry S. Mattice, Jr.  
HARRY S. MATTICE, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE